

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 are pending with claims 1-6 and 15-16 being withdrawn from further consideration.

The Examiner objected to the Title. The Title has been changed to the Title suggested by the Examiner.

An Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this Amendment.

Formal drawings were filed June 11, 2001 and were accepted by the Examiner as indicated in the Office Action Summary.

Claims 7-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Horski 5,734,219. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that Horski shows attaching structure of a choke and, a brush card having first and second opposing sides and a pair of openings through the opposing sides with each attaching structure being disposed through an associated opening and bent so as to be adjacent to the second side, with the wound portion of the choke being disposed on the first side of the brush card, such that the choke is secured to the brush card. It is respectfully submitted that such structure is neither taught nor suggested by Horski. Nowhere in Horski does it show or describe openings through the brush card that receive the attaching structure with the attaching structure being disposed on one side of the brush card and the wound portion of the choke being on the other side of the brush card. The Examiner merely contends that Horski teaches these features of claim 7 without indicating where such features are shown or described in Horski. In fact, there is no rear view of the brush card shown in Horski, and there is no mention that a portion of the chokes extends through the brush card in Horski. Thus, it is not clear how the Examiner arrives at the conclusion that there are opening in the brush card of Horski for receiving an attaching structure of a choke. Horski merely shows that ends of the chokes 106 are coupled to bus bars 111. The purpose of the elongated ends portions of the chokes as defined in the claims is to eliminate the use of bus bars.

For the reasons advanced above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 7, and the claims which depend therefrom, is improper and should be withdrawn.

With regard to the dependent claims, claim 9 recites that at least one of the attaching structures includes a first portion extending transversely from an associated elongated end portion and generally along the common plane, a second portion extending downwardly and transversely with respect to the first portion, a third portion extending from the second portion so as to be generally parallel with the first portion, and a fourth portion bent to extend upwardly from the third portion to an associated outermost coil, the fourth portion being generally parallel with respect to the second portion. The Examiner again merely recites these features of claim 9 and contends that these features are taught by Horski, without indicating where in Horski such details are provided. There is no structure used for attaching the choke to the brush card in Horski, let alone attaching structure having the four portions as defined in claim 9. The chokes 106 of Horski are attached to the bus bars 111 which in turn are attached to the brush cards. Thus, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 states that at least one of the attaching structures includes a first portion extending downwardly and transversely with respect to an associated elongated end portion, a second portion extending transversely from the first portion and a third portion extending upwardly from the second portion to an associated outermost coil, the third portion being generally parallel with respect to the first portion. In rejecting claim 10, the Examiner had not even addressed where these specific features are shown in Horski. Therefore, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 12, Horski does not teach or suggest an elongated end portion extending from an attaching structure a distance substantially equal to a length of the portion wound about the axis. Therefore this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 13 Horski does not teach attaching structures that are bent so as extend away from each other at the second side of the brush card. Therefore, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner, in citing Horski, has merely found a brush card having a choke connected to a bus bar. There is no teaching or suggestion of the choke coupled to the brush card via the attaching structure as claimed. If the Examiner maintains the rejections, it is requested that in the next Action, the Examiner point to the specific column or figure of Horski describing or showing each and every claimed feature.

All objections and rejections having been address, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank J. Nuzzi  
Registration No. 42,944  
Attorney for Applicant

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
186 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830  
Tel. No. (732) 321-3002